

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Appln. No. 10/053,555

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Applicants are submitting herewith one (1) replacement sheet of drawings, which includes FIG. 12. The submitted replacement sheet is intended to replace FIG. 12 as filed on April 3, 2002.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Because the amendments made hereby are believed to place the case in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the instant Amendment be entered at the present time.

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-7 and 9-13 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 14 and 15 have been canceled. Claims 1-4 and 9-13 presently stand rejected. Claims 5, 6, 14 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Although not expressly stated in the Office Action of February 13, 2004, it seems that the Examiner has withdrawn the objection to the drawings as noted in the Office Action of July 30, 2003. Accordingly, Applicant is submitting herewith a replacement drawing for Fig. 12. Confirmation on the record that the drawing objection has been withdrawn is kindly requested.

In regard to the claim rejections, claims 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 1-4, 7, 9, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art (Fig. 12, submitted by applicant) in view of Kuramochi et al. (USP 6,252,176); and Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art (Fig. 12, submitted by applicant) in view of Kuramochi et al. (USP 6,252,176) and further in view of Kishimoto et al. (USP 6,524,892). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests favorable disposition of the Application.

Argument

In regard to the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Applicant points out to the Examiner that claim 10 merely further narrows that which is claimed in claim 9. Specifically, claim 9 requires that the characteristic impedance of the flexible wiring circuit board be within 10 percent, i.e., $\pm 10\%$, of the characteristic impedance of the suspension board. Claim 10 further limits claim 9 by requiring that the characteristic impedance of the flexible wiring circuit board be substantially equal to the characteristic impedance of the suspension board. Applicant submits that it is not inconsistent to require that two impedances be within 10 % of each other in an independent claim and further claim the two impedances to be “substantially equal” in a dependent claim. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the §112 rejection of claim 10 is requested.

In regard to the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Applicant has amended claim 13 to clarify that a metal layer is formed on both of two sides of the flexible wiring circuit board. That is, one metal layer is formed, in claim 7, on the side of the flexible wiring circuit board that has the terminal portions, and a second metal layer is additionally formed, in claim 13, on the other side of the flexible wiring circuit board.

In regard to the prior art rejections, although Applicant does not agree with the Examiner that it would have been obvious to combine the independent teaching of Kuramochi et al. with the prior art device disclosed in FIG. 12 of the present application, in order to advance prosecution of the application Applicant has rewritten allowable claim 14 in independent form, i.e., by adding the features of claim 14 to those of claim 1. As recognized by the Examiner, the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest a junction flexible wiring circuit board as set forth in

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Appln. No. 10/053,555


claim 1, wherein the metal layer *does not contact the terminal portion*. Similarly, Applicant has combined the features of allowable claim 15 with those of claim 9. Claims 14 and 15 are canceled.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Kevin M. Barner
Registration No. 46,075

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 13, 2004

Attorney Docket No.: Q68175